DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 326 752 CG 022 959

AUTHOR Tomlinson-Keasey, Carol A.; Blurton, Elizabeth J.
TITLE Similarities and Differences between Contemporary Women and Terman's Gifted Women.
SPONS AGENCY California Univ., Riverside.; Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE 11 Aug 90
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (98th, Boston, MA, August 10-14, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) --

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement; Adults; Comparative Analysis; *Educational Attainment; *Employment Level; *Females; *Gifted; *Life Satisfaction
IDENTIFIERS *Terman (Lewis M)

ABSTRACT

The Terman longitudinal data set examined a variety of variables that shaped the personal and professional achievements of 672 gifted women. While the variables identified in this 60-year study started by Lewis Terman in 1921 are provocative, one must ask whether the predictors identified as meaningful for the Terman women would apply to a group of contemporary women. This study compared responses of 485 contemporary women with the responses of the Terman women to a host of questions covering their aspirations, educational and occupational achievement, satisfaction with life, personal adjustment, and their childhood families. Of the contemporary women, 306 were identified as gifted and 179 were identified as being of normal intelligence. Comparisons were made between the Terman gifted women and the contemporary gifted women, between the gifted contemporary women and the normal contemporary women, and between the Terman women who attended college in the 1930s and contemporary women who attended college in the 1960s. Contemporary women, not surprisingly, had surpassed the Terman women in educational and occupational achievements. Despite these clear gains, the contemporary women reported significantly lower levels of satisfaction in all spheres of their lives. (Author/NB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED326752

# SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CONTEMPORARY WOMEN AND TERMAN'S GIFTED WOMEN

Carol A. Tomlinson-Keasey

and

Elizabeth J. Blurton

University of California--Riverside

Authors' Address:

Psychology Department
University of California--Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

CG022959

**Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention in Boston, MA, August 11, 1990.** This research was supported by research grants to the first author from the Spencer Foundation and the University of California--Riverside. The study owes a special debt to Robert Sears and Albert Hastorf of Stanford University for helping us gain access to the data from the Genetic Studies of Genius.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Tomlinson-Keasey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

**Similarities and Differences Between Contemporary Women and Terman's Gifted Women**


Abstract

The Terman longitudinal data set examined a variety of variables that shaped the personal and professional achievements of 672 gifted women. While the variables identified in this 60 year study are provocative; one must ask whether the predictors identified as meaningful for the Terman women would apply to a group of contemporary women. The present study compared responses of 485 contemporary women with the responses of the Terman women to a host of questions covering their aspirations educational and occupational achievement, satisfaction with life, personal adjustment, and their childhood families. Contemporary women, not surprisingly, had surpassed the Terman women in educational and occupational achievements. Despite these clear gains, the contemporary women reported significantly lower levels of satisfaction in all spheres of their lives.

## Similarities and Difference Between Contemporary Women and Terman's Gifted Women

The 60 year longitudinal study started by Lewis Terman in 1921 followed a sample of gifted women from age 10 into their retirement years (P. Sears, 1979; R. Sears, 1977, 1983; Terman & Oden, 1947, 1959) . The data, known collectively as the Genetic Studies of Genius, have been used to answer a variety of contemporary psychological questions. Predictors of suicide for this sample of women have been explored (Tomlinson-Keasey, Warren, & Elliott, 1986); concomitants of life-satisfaction have been examined (Sears & Barbee, 1972); and paths to intellectual and occupational achievement have been charted (Tomlinson-Keasey & Little, 1990). While the variables identified in these studies are provocative; a central question that must be asked is whether the predictors that were meaningful for the Terman women would apply to a group of contemporary women.

The Terman women as a group experienced particular events, such as the Depression and World War II, which altered their lives (Elder, 1985). The educational obstacles and cultural expectations these women faced were less distinctive than the World War, but were no less pervasive in terms of their impact.

Although many obvious and glaring differences existed in the cultural backdrop surrounding these two samples of women, the two cohorts, one which finished college in the 1930s and a second which finished college in the 1960s, seem to have some similarities. Tomlinson-Keasey (1990) has identified several patterns of behavior that do

not seem to have changed despite the dramatic change in opportunities for women. Contemporary women still lack confidence in their skills and look to or seek the direction and support of a mentor, husband, or manager in order to realize their career potential. Contemporary women continue to shy away from setting specific, individualistic career goals. Contemporary women continue to be pulled in several directions by the social context surrounding them. This means career goals and aspirations are often modified by personal exigencies.

These similarities noted between contemporary women and the Terman women were based on current reviews of the literature mentioning lack of self confidence (Sleeper & Nigro, 1987; Deaux, 1979) and the force of social relationships for women (Gilligan, 1982). The present paper provides a direct comparison of the responses of the Terman women with responses from contemporary women. These groups of women, reaching maturity a generation apart, provide an index of the constancies as well as the changes that have confronted women during the last 35 years.

## Subjects and Method

The Terman study began in 1921 with 672 gifted women who were followed from age 11. In 1982, 434 of these women were still alive and in contact with the study. During their years in the study, they had been asked over 4,000 questions in which they chronicled their aspirations and their actualization of those dreams.

In 1986, a 19 page questionnaire was devised which asked a sample of contemporary women 123 of the same questions asked of the Terman women. The

contemporary women responded to questions covering their educational and occupational achievements, their levels of satisfaction with their lives, and an assessment of their family history. They evaluated their relationship with their parents and spouses, and provided ratings of themselves on a variety of traits which had been identified as important predictors for the Terman women.

This questionnaire was administered to 485 women. Because all of the Terman women were intellectually gifted, it was important to have a sample of contemporary women who were also gifted. In order to assess cohort differences, our contemporary group also needed to include women who were not intellectually gifted. The gifted women in the contemporary sample were obtained through the cooperation of a local Mensa chapter. In addition, parents of gifted children were asked to participate. Many of the mothers had been identified as gifted as children. The normal sample was obtained by asking women returning to their 20th high school reunions to participate. All of the gifted subjects had, at some time in their life, achieved an IQ of 132 or higher on an intelligence test. The 306 gifted women in the contemporary sample averaged 37 years of age. The women of normal intelligence were women returning to their 20th high school reunion. The 179 women in this sample averaged 39 years of age.

These three groups of subjects allowed us to make the following a priori comparisons:

- Comparisons between the Terman gifted women and a contemporary sample of gifted women.
- Comparisons between the gifted contemporary women and a sample of

normal contemporary women

- Comparisons between the Terman women who attended college in the 1930s and a group of contemporary women who attended college in the 1960s.

The following factors were compared:

- the aspirations of the women
- the educational and occupational achievements of the women
- the life satisfaction of women in five areas
- personal adjustment of the women
- family of origin data and parental values

The 123 items used in this study were initially asked of the Terman women from 1940 to 1977. The majority of the items were reproduced exactly from the 1950 questionnaire sent to the Terman women (see Terman and Oden, 1959).

## Results and Discussion

A one-way analysis of variance comparing the three groups of subjects was performed for each of the 123 variables of interest (see Tables 1-5). To guard against type I errors, the alpha level for these analyses was set at $p < .01$. These F tests only address the statistical relationships between the three groups of subjects. Although these are necessary to the analysis, they are only a part of a larger picture which examines patterns of women's responses in different areas of their lives. Still, the F tests indicate that the three groups differed significantly on 80 of the 123 comparisons. For 64 of these differences, the probability of the difference occurring by chance was less than .0001.

To address the questions guiding this study, we performed three sets of a priori nonorthogonal contrasts. The first comparisons of interest were between the Terman sample and the entire contemporary sample. Societal differences that have altered the environment for all women emerged in these comparisons. The second comparisons of interest were between the Terman sample, who were all intellectually gifted, and the subset of contemporary women who were gifted. These comparisons catalogued the different pressures and opportunities that have emerged for gifted women over the last 35 years. A final set of planned comparisons examined the differences between the two groups of contemporary women. These comparisons tell us how we are using our intellectual resources and whether these two sets of contemporary women have experienced similar challenges, satisfactions, etc.

All planned comparisons used Dunn's multiple comparison procedure. This is a conservative technique for comparing means which minimizes Type I errors by dividing the alpha level between the comparisons to be made (Kirk, 1982). The alpha level was set at .02 meaning that all significant comparisons met or exceeded the critical value of $t = 2.72$. These precautions against type I errors insured that random significant findings would not cloud the patterns of responses that emerged.

## Aspirations

The aspirations of the three groups of women show an interesting pattern of change (see Table 1). Before age 20, the Terman women were less concerned about money and more concerned about schoolwork than the contemporary women. After age 20, however, the contemporary women had significantly higher aspirations than the Terman women in all areas except friendships.

Looking at the ambitions of these women, we see that the contemporary women were more ambitious in every area examined except maintaining a standard of living (see Table 1). The aspired toward excellence in their work and wanted to be recognized for their achievements. Appreciation in terms of both vocational advancement and financial remuneration were expected.

When asked if the received as much education as they desired, the Terman women were significantly more likely to respond yes than the contemporary women. Perhaps this was because, as young adults, the Terman women were not as concerned about their careers as the contemporary women. The Terman women placed both

family life and friendships higher than the contemporary women on their list of life's priorities. It is interesting to note that the relative evaluation of the three groups was the same--all gave family life the highest priority. Overall, then, the contemporary women were much clearer in their career orientations, desired success in a variety of arenas, and placed less importance on their family and friendships.

---

Insert Table 1 here

---

The pattern of findings between the two cohorts is largely replicated in the comparisons of the two gifted groups of women. The Terman gifted women were more satisfied with their level of education than the contemporary women. The two groups of gifted women saw school success as equally important prior to age 20. After age 20, the contemporary women placed significantly more importance on succeeding in school than the Terman women. Presumably, this reflected the wider opportunities available to contemporary gifted women graduating from college.

The two groups of contemporary women showed occasional differences in their aspirations (6 significant differences in 27 planned comparisons). The gifted women prized leadership, schoolwork, excellence in their work and their careers more highly than their less gifted counterparts.

## Achievement

Having examined the different aspirations these women held, we turn to a catalogue of their achievements. The cohort differences were not unexpected.

Contemporary women received significantly higher levels of education and were more likely to feel that they ave lived up to their intellectual potential (see Table 2). For the contemporary woman, these educational achievements were matched by success in a variety of occupations. The contemporary women were significantly more likely to be employed in professional capacities and to have pursued careers in a particular area.

---

Insert Table 2 here

---

When asked what factors contributed to their achievement, contemporary women were more likely than the Terman women to cite their mental ability, persistence, work ethic, and personality as important. Interestingly, they also cited chance as playing a larger role in their achievement. The Terman women were more likely than the contemporary women to cite their lack of persistence and poor work habits when thinking about factors that hindered their achievement.

The pattern of results between the two cohorts is mirrored exactly in the results comparing the two gifted groups.

The achievement comparisons between the two groups of contemporary women present a different picture. The contemporary women who were not intellectually gifted had fewer years of education than the gifted contemporary women and were less likely to have graduated from college with honors. Further, these women were significantly less likely to see mental ability as a factor contributing to their achievement.

In the 35 years between these two assessments, women made significant strides in both the educational and occupational arenas. Further, contemporary women saw

hard work, persistence, and ability as qualities that are rewarded.

Satisfaction with Life

The cohort differences in both aspirations and achievements document the different environments in which these women matured. But how satisfied were these three groups of women with various aspects of their lives. The results, presented in Table 3, examined the satisfaction these women derived from their family, their marriage, their social relationships, and their occupations. Any or all of these areas might have been rewarding from the woman's perspective. The results indicated that the Terman women were more satisfied with their families and their marriages than contemporary women. In terms of social relationships, the Terman women expressed more satisfaction with their friendships and a variety of volunteer, cultural, and avocational activities. The single exception to this pattern involved hobbies. Contemporary women derived more satisfaction from this area of their lives (see Table 3).

---

Insert Table 3 here

---

In the area of occupational satisfaction, contemporary women, despite their higher levels of occupational achievement, did not derive more satisfaction. When asked how satisfied they were with their occupational success, there were no significant differences between the three groups of women. When asked how satisfied they were with their income producing work, the Terman women reported significantly higher levels of satisfaction than contemporary women. Perhaps these higher levels of occupational

satisfaction reflect the fact that few of the Terman women felt compelled to work. Just being able to make a choice about whether you will work or not may affect levels of occupational satisfaction.

The pattern of satisfaction reported in the two cohorts is repeated in the comparisons between the two gifted groups with two exceptions. The gifted samples did not differ in their assessments of satisfaction with family life or in their overall satisfaction with their present marriage.

A comparison of life satisfaction between the two contemporary groups indicated few differences. The gifted woman in the contemporary sample was less likely to be married. On all of the other indices presented in Table 3, there were no differences.

The data on satisfaction with life stand in sharp contrast to the data on aspirations and achievements, which showed that contemporary women have higher expectations than the Terman women and that these expectations are matched with higher levels of achievement. The Terman women derived more satisfaction than contemporary women from almost every area of their lives. Even in the occupational arena, contemporary women were not deriving higher levels of satisfaction.

## Personal Adjustment

Given the results on life satisfaction, we might expect contemporary women to be more maladjusted than the Terman women. This was not the case. The three groups indicated very similar levels of severe maladjustment; however, the contemporary women did report significantly higher levels of stress in their lives. On

the positive side, contemporary women showed significantly higher levels of self-confidence, integration, persistence, and they indicated fewer feelings of inferiority.

---
Insert Table 4 here
---

Comparisons of the two gifted groups repeated the personal adjustment pattern evident between the two cohorts. The two groups of contemporary women did not differ on any of the indices of personal adjustment.

In terms of severe maladjustment, the three groups of women did not differ. However, the contemporary women expressed higher levels of self-confidence and felt that they had the persistence to achieve their goals.

Family of Origin

Thirty-five years ago, parents were less likely to divorce; hence fewer of the Terman women lived with stepparents or guardians during their childhood and adolescence. As a further comment on this objective assessment of their childhood homes, the Terman women remembered their parents' marriages as being happier and their childhoods as being happier than contemporary women. Levels of punishment in the home were not remembered as being different, but the Terman women were more likely than contemporary women to report that parents used "firm, but not harsh" methods of discipline (see Table 5).

---
Insert Table 5 here
---

Although the Terman women paint a rosier picture of the emotional climate in their childhood homes, the financial picture was more problematic. The Terman women felt their homes were less secure financially. There were no differences between the Terman women and the contemporary women in terms of their fathers' occupational levels, but the mothers of the contemporary women were more likely to work, suggesting that their financial situation was more secure. All three groups of parents encouraged their daughters to attend college. The parents of gifted women were more likely to demand good grades.

A closer examination of Table 5 indicates that these women's family relationships differed in systematic ways. All three groups of women reported similarly high levels of admiration for their parents and remembered their parents as being helpful. Somewhat surprisingly, there were no differences between the three groups in the way the families were perceived as handling their daughter's independence.

The Terman women report several differences which indicate that they had closer relationships with their fathers than the contemporary women. The Terman women reported being more attached to their fathers, remembered their fathers with deeper affection, and felt less rejected by their fathers. They remembered their fathers as being more solicitous, yet more domineering than the fathers of contemporary women. The contemporary women report that their fathers were friendlier than the Terman women.

Comparisons of the two groups of gifted women repeat many of the findings between the two cohorts. The contemporary gifted women, who were college students

in the 1960s rebelled against their fathers and reported higher levels of conflict with their mothers than the Terman women. Otherwise the patterns of responses were the same as the two cohorts.

More differences between the two samples of contemporary women emerged in this analysis than in the other areas of life that have already been examined. The gifted contemporary women reported a stronger relationship with their mothers. They felt deeper affection and stronger attachments for their mothers, and saw their mothers as more helpful than their nongifted peers. Perhaps it is not surprising that the parents of the gifted contemporary women were seen as more intelligent than the parents of the normal women.

To summarize the results, the patterns of responses reported in the present study indicate that the past thirty five years have brought significant changes to the lives of women. Higher levels of educational achievement have been accompanied by occupational advancements. The modern woman feels confident of her ability to take advantage of the increased opportunities. Unfortunately, the increased levels of stress among contemporary women indicate that these advances have not been achieved without some toll. Women today report higher levels of dissatisfaction with all aspects of their lives than the women of the previous generation. The satisfactions which might follow from the obvious advances in the work force have yet to be reflected in these women's personal statements.

References

Deaux, K. (1979). Self-evaluations of male and female managers. Sex Roles, 5, 571-580.

Elder, G. H. (1985). Studying women's lives: Research questions, strategies and lessons. Unpublished manuscript.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Kirk, R. E. (1982) Experimental Design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences (2nd Ed.). Brooks/Cole: Belmont, CA.

Sears, P. S. (1979). The Terman genetic studies of genius: 1922-1972. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), The seventy-eighth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 75-96). Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Sears, P. S., & Barbee, A. H. (1977). Career and life satisfactions among Terman's gifted women. In J. C. Stanley, W. C. George, & C. H. Solano (Eds.), The gifted and the creative: A fifty-year perspective (pp. 28-65). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Sears, R. R. (1977). Source of life satisfactions of the Terman gifted men. American Psychologist, 32, 119-128.

Sears, R. R. (1983). The Terman Gifted Study. Manuscript available from the Terman project, Stanford University.

Sleeper, L. A., & Nigro, G. N. (1987). It's not who you are but who you're with: Self confidence in achievement settings. Sex Roles, 16, 57-70.

Terman, L. M., & Oden, M. H. (1947). Genetic studies of genius: Vol. 4. The gifted child grows up. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Terman, L. M., & Oden, M. H. (1959). Genetic studies of genius: Vol. 5. The gifted group at mid-life. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Tomlinson-Keasey, C. (1990). The working lives of Terman's gifted women. In H. Y. Grossman and N. L. Chester (Eds.) The experience and meaning of work in women's lives. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 213-240.

Tomlinson-Keasey, C., & Little, T. D. (1990). Predicting Educational Attainment, Occupational Achievement, Intellectual Skills and Personal Adjustment among Gifted Men and Women. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82.

Tomlinson-Keasey, C., Warren, L., & Elliott, J. (1986). Suicide among gifted women: A prospective study. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 95, 122-130.

Table 1

**ASPIRATIONS**

| | Terman Women | | | Contemp. Gifted | | | Contemp. Normal | | | Total Contemporary | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | | Mean | SD | | Mean | SD | | Mean | SD | |
| Importance of Success before Age 12 (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| In sports | 2.86 | 1.21 | | 2.73 | 1.33 | | 2.77 | 1.37 | | 2.75 | 1.35 | |
| As a leader | 2.78 | 1.18 | | 2.97 | 1.15 | * | 2.55 | 1.09 | | 2.82 | 1.14 | |
| with friendships | 3.56 | 0.86 | | 3.56 | 0.88 | | 3.51 | 0.92 | | 3.54 | .89 | |
| with money | 1.62 | 0.88 | * | 2.16 | 1.12 | | 2.16 | 1.12 | | 2.16 | 1.12 | ** |
| social success | 2.38 | 1.05 | * | 2.75 | 1.10 | | 2.61 | 1.09 | | 2.70 | 1.10 | ** |
| in schoolwork | 4.06 | 0.90 | | 3.93 | 1.10 | * | 3.42 | 1.01 | | 3.74 | 1.09 | ** |
| Importance of Success between 12 and 20 (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| In sports | 2.80 | 1.23 | | 2.89 | 1.35 | | 2.79 | 1.40 | | 2.85 | 1.37 | |
| As a leader | 3.15 | 1.09 | | 3.34 | 1.07 | | 3.09 | 1.04 | | 3.25 | 1.07 | |
| with friendships | 3.84 | 0.78 | | 3.76 | 0.85 | | 3.69 | 0.81 | | 3.74 | .84 | |
| with money | 2.56 | 1.00 | * | 3.01 | 1.05 | | 3.02 | 0.96 | | 3.01 | 1.02 | ** |
| social success | 3.42 | 0.96 | | 3.31 | 0.99 | | 3.23 | 1.07 | | 3.28 | 1.02 | |
| in schoolwork | 3.99 | 0.84 | | 3.92 | 1.05 | * | 3.65 | 0.95 | | 3.82 | 1.02 | ** |
| Importance of Success after age 20 (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| In sports | 1.92 | 1.05 | * | 2.48 | 1.29 | | 2.44 | 1.29 | | 2.47 | 1.29 | ** |
| As a leader | 2.83 | 1.07 | * | 3.67 | 1.07 | | 3.61 | 0.95 | | 3.65 | 1.03 | ** |
| with friendships | 3.65 | 0.75 | | 3.48 | 0.87 | | 3.48 | 0.85 | | 3.48 | .86 | ** |
| with money | 3.03 | 0.88 | * | 3.54 | 0.91 | | 3.61 | 0.82 | | 3.57 | .88 | ** |
| social success | 2.81 | 0.91 | * | 3.11 | 0.99 | | 3.09 | 1.00 | | 3.10 | .99 | ** |
| in schoolwork | 3.34 | 1.12 | * | 3.87 | 0.98 | | 3.89 | 0.94 | | 3.88 | .97 | ** |
| Ambition (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Excellence in work | 3.89 | 0.70 | * | 4.33 | 0.68 | * | 4.15 | 0.75 | | 4.27 | .71 | ** |
| Recognition of Achievements | 3.17 | 0.74 | * | 3.58 | 0.90 | | 3.52 | 0.98 | | 3.56 | .93 | ** |
| Vocational Advancement | 3.09 | 0.86 | * | 3.79 | 0.98 | * | 3.41 | 1.05 | | 3.65 | 1.02 | ** |
| Financial Gain | 2.74 | 0.84 | * | 3.23 | 1.01 | | 3.43 | 0.96 | | 3.31 | .99 | ** |
| Maintaining standard of living | 3.29 | 0.89 | | 3.39 | 0.99 | | 3.51 | 0.92 | | 3.43 | .97 | |
| Received desired education? (2pt) | 1.74 | 0.44 | | 1.65 | 0.48 | | 1.66 | 0.47 | | 1.66 | .48 | ** |
| As a young adult (4 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Importance of Career | 2.23 | 0.93 | * | 2.75 | 0.86 | * | 2.35 | 0.94 | | 2.60 | .91 | ** |
| Importance of family life | 3.34 | 0.87 | * | 2.87 | 1.01 | | 2.95 | 0.98 | | 2.91 | 1.00 | ** |
| Importance of friendships | 2.67 | 0.82 | * | 2.35 | 0.79 | | 2.37 | 0.79 | | 2.36 | .79 | ** |

* planned comparisons between adjacent columns are significant $p < .02$

** planned comparisons between Terman cohort and contemporary cohort are significant $p < .02$

Table 2

## ACHIEVEMENTS

| | Terman Women Mean | SD | | Contemporary Gifted Mean | SD | | Contemporary Normal Mean | SD | Total Contemporary Mean | SD | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Education | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Highest grade completed | 7.84 | 2.04 | * | 9.41 | 2.83 | * | 8.37 | 2.85 | 9.03 | 2.87 | ** |
| Scholastic Honoraries (2pt) | .34 | .64 | | .28 | .60 | | .22 | .51 | .26 | .57 | |
| Honors at graduation (2 pt) | 1.28 | .45 | | 1.36 | .48 | * | 1.17 | .38 | 1.29 | .45 | |
| Actualized your intellectual skills? (6 point scale) | 4.48 | .78 | * | 4.74 | .81 | | 4.71 | .75 | 4.73 | .79 | ** |
| Occupation (3 point scales unless otherwise indicated) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Work Pattern 30-34 | 2.01 | .97 | * | 2.59 | .67 | | 2.52 | .73 | 2.55 | .71 | ** |
| Work Pattern 35-39 | 1.88 | .95 | * | 2.75 | .55 | | 2.62 | .70 | 2.68 | .64 | ** |
| Work Pattern 41-56 | 2.18 | .96 | * | 2.84 | .44 | | 2.77 | .54 | 2.80 | .50 | ** |
| Occupational Level (4 pt) | 1.32 | 1.64 | * | 3.04 | 1.12 | | 2.76 | 1.28 | 2.93 | 1.19 | ** |
| Factors contributing to your achievement (3 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Superior mental ability | .74 | .70 | * | 1.21 | .70 | * | .77 | .77 | 1.04 | .76 | ** |
| Adequate education | 1.01 | .63 | | 1.08 | .61 | | .98 | .64 | 1.04 | .62 | |
| Good social adjustment | .76 | .65 | | .77 | .68 | | .70 | .63 | .75 | .67 | |
| Good Personality | .66 | .61 | * | .99 | .70 | | .97 | .71 | .98 | .70 | ** |
| Good mental stability | .79 | .65 | | .86 | .67 | | .91 | .67 | .88 | .67 | |
| Persistence | .53 | .70 | * | 1.08 | .78 | | 1.08 | .77 | 1.07 | .77 | ** |
| Good work habits | .46 | .64 | * | .96 | .76 | | .97 | .74 | .96 | .75 | ** |
| Health | .69 | .67 | | .69 | .63 | | .75 | .69 | .71 | .66 | |
| Chance | .14 | .42 | * | .36 | .60 | | .25 | .50 | .32 | .57 | ** |
| Factors hindering achievement (3 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inferior mental ability | .01 | .12 | | .02 | .18 | | .05 | .22 | .03 | .20 | |
| Inadequate education | .19 | .45 | | .21 | .50 | | .21 | .45 | .21 | .48 | |
| Poor Social Adjustment | .27 | .53 | | .21 | .49 | | .15 | .42 | .19 | .46 | |
| Poor personality | .09 | .30 | | .08 | .30 | | .07 | .26 | .08 | .28 | |
| Mental instability | .14 | .39 | | .11 | .40 | | .04 | .26 | .09 | .36 | |
| Lack of persistence | .57 | .65 | * | .24 | .50 | | .22 | .45 | .23 | .48 | ** |
| Poor work habits | .43 | .62 | * | .22 | .47 | | .13 | .40 | .19 | .45 | ** |
| Poor health | .18 | .41 | | .11 | .39 | | .08 | .31 | .10 | .36 | |
| Chance | .15 | .37 | | .13 | .39 | | .12 | .34 | .13 | .38 | |

* planned comparisons between adjacent columns are significant $p < .02$

** planned comparisons between Terman cohort and contemporary cohort are significant $p < .02$

Table 3

## SATISFACTION WITH LIFE

| | Terman Women | | | Contemporary Gifted | | | Contemporary Normal | | Total Contemporary | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Mean | SD | | Mean | SD | | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | |
| Satisfaction with Family (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| with family life | 4.07 | 1.05 | | 3.86 | 1.08 | | 3.72 | 1.24 | 3.81 | 1.14 | ** |
| with children | 4.61 | .72 | * | 4.38 | .81 | | 4.47 | .86 | 4.42 | .83 | ** |
| Satisfaction with Marriage (4 point scales unless otherwise indicated) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Current marital Status (2 pt) | 0.91 | .29 | * | 0.73 | .44 | * | 0.91 | .29 | .79 | .40 | ** |
| with present marriage (5 pt) | 4.34 | .99 | | 4.11 | 1.18 | | 3.95 | 1.24 | 4.04 | 1.20 | ** |
| Marital Happiness (7 pt) | 5.79 | 1.24 | * | 5.03 | 1.72 | | 4.77 | 1.71 | 4.92 | 1.72 | ** |
| Well-suited sexually (5 pt) | 3.53 | .83 | * | 3.23 | .93 | | 3.15 | .94 | 3.19 | .93 | ** |
| Don't regret marriage | 3.42 | .85 | * | 3.07 | .95 | | 3.02 | .98 | 3.05 | .96 | ** |
| Enjoy leisure with spouse | 2.95 | .91 | * | 2.36 | 1.03 | | 2.19 | 1.06 | 2.29 | 1.04 | ** |
| Spouse is never irritating | 1.84 | .94 | * | 1.45 | .82 | | 1.55 | .84 | 1.49 | .83 | ** |
| Never separated/divorced (2 pt) | 1.77 | .42 | * | 1.52 | .50 | | 1.46 | .50 | 1.49 | .50 | ** |
| Satisfaction with Social Relationships (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| with friends | 4.29 | .80 | * | 3.74 | 1.00 | | 3.77 | .99 | 3.75 | .99 | ** |
| with avocational activities | 4.50 | .61 | * | 3.94 | .94 | | 3.88 | .92 | 3.92 | .94 | ** |
| with friendships | 4.39 | .66 | * | 3.72 | .95 | | 3.83 | .90 | 3.76 | .93 | ** |
| with community service | 3.98 | .86 | * | 3.40 | 1.08 | | 3.41 | 1.08 | 3.40 | 1.78 | ** |
| with cultural activities | 4.20 | .74 | * | 3.49 | 1.02 | | 3.33 | 1.04 | 3.43 | 1.03 | ** |
| with recreation | 4.26 | .71 | * | 3.79 | .96 | | 3.67 | 1.03 | 3.75 | .99 | ** |
| with hobbies | 3.53 | .92 | * | 3.86 | .88 | | 3.76 | .89 | 3.82 | .88 | ** |
| Satisfaction with Occupational Aspects of Life (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| with occupational success | 3.67 | 1.06 | | 3.73 | 1.09 | | 3.52 | 1.19 | 3.65 | 1.13 | |
| with income producing work | 4.35 | .78 | * | 3.72 | .94 | | 3.63 | 1.06 | 3.68 | .97 | ** |
| Adult Family | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Number of children | 2.21 | .91 | | 2.30 | 1.28 | | 2.62 | 1.11 | 2.46 | 1.21 | ** |
| Effect of woman's employment on marriage (3 pt) | 2.12 | .64 | | 2.24 | .69 | | 2.14 | .76 | 2.19 | .72 | |

* planned comparisons between adjacent columns are significant $p < .02$

** planned comparisons between Terman cohort and contemporary cohort are significant $p < .02$

| | Mean | SD | p | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | Mean | SD | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Personal Characteristics (11 point scales unless otherwise indicated) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self-confidence | 6.36 | 1.73 | * | 7.96 | 1.94 | 7.78 | 1.94 | 7.89 | 1.94 | ** |
| Integration | 6.14 | 1.42 | * | 6.85 | 1.82 | 6.81 | 1.75 | 6.84 | 1.79 | ** |
| Persistence | 7.10 | 1.65 | * | 8.77 | 1.63 | 8.52 | 1.84 | 8.68 | 1.71 | ** |
| Feelings of inferiority | 5.06 | 1.37 | * | 6.80 | 2.54 | 6.34 | 2.45 | 6.63 | 2.51 | ** |
| Social ability in youth (3 pt) | 1.86 | .61 | | 1.96 | .77 | 1.85 | .69 | 1.92 | .74 | |
| Anxiety Levels (3 point scales unless otherwise indicated) | | | | | | | | | | |
| Nervousness | .62 | .72 | * | 1.13 | .73 | 1.11 | .62 | 1.12 | .69 | ** |
| Personal adjustment | 1.61 | .61 | | 1.68 | .57 | 1.71 | .55 | 1.69 | .56 | |
| Energy (5 pt) | 3.36 | 1.01 | | 3.45 | .94 | 3.28 | .95 | 3.39 | .94 | |

* planned comparisons between adjacent columns are significant $p < .02$
** planned comparisons between Terman cohort and contemporary cohort are significant $p < .02$

Table 5

## FAMILY OF ORIGIN

| | Terman Women Mean | SD | | Contemporary Gifted Mean | SD | | Contemporary Normal Mean | SD | Total Contemporary Mean | SD | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Stability of Home (2 point scales unless otherwise indicated) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Parents' marital happiness (7) | 5.15 | 1.50 | * | 4.08 | 1.74 | | 3.87 | 1.84 | 4.00 | 1.78 | ** |
| Parents divorced or separated | .10 | .31 | * | .25 | .43 | | .24 | .43 | .25 | .43 | ** |
| Guardian after divorce | .57 | .94 | * | 1.16 | .58 | | 1.13 | .52 | 1.14 | .56 | ** |
| Did you have a stepparent | .13 | .33 | * | .22 | .41 | | .28 | .45 | .24 | .43 | ** |
| Financial security (4 pt) | 2.47 | .83 | * | 2.71 | .86 | | 2.54 | .84 | 2.65 | .85 | ** |
| Father's occupation (4 pt) | 2.88 | .87 | * | 3.11 | .92 | * | 2.78 | .98 | 2.98 | .95 | |
| Mother's occupation (4 pt) | .38 | 1.05 | * | .84 | 1.27 | | .82 | 1.23 | .83 | 1.25 | ** |
| Discipline in Home | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Authoritative home (4 pt) | 3.57 | .68 | * | 3.29 | .89 | | 3.28 | .88 | 3.29 | .89 | ** |
| Temperate punishment (3 pt) | 2.53 | .58 | | 2.48 | .58 | | 2.39 | .60 | 2.45 | .59 | |
| Childhood happiness (5 pt) | 3.64 | 1.00 | | 3.44 | 1.07 | | 3.21 | 1.03 | 3.35 | 1.06 | ** |
| Family of Origin (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Admiration for father | 3.37 | 1.13 | | 3.29 | 1.22 | | 3.21 | 1.19 | 3.26 | 1.21 | |
| Admiration for mother | 3.27 | 1.09 | | 3.19 | 1.18 | | 3.05 | 1.06 | 3.14 | 1.14 | |
| Rebellion toward father | 1.36 | 1.19 | * | 1.64 | 1.22 | * | 1.27 | 1.22 | 1.50 | 1.24 | |
| Rebellion toward mother | 1.69 | 1.20 | | 1.68 | 1.26 | | 1.56 | 1.21 | 1.63 | 1.24 | |
| Father fostered independence | 3.21 | 1.12 | | 3.39 | 1.56 | | 3.12 | 1.16 | 3.28 | 1.16 | |
| Mother fostered independence | 3.34 | 1.05 | | 3.47 | 1.12 | | 3.21 | 1.12 | 3.37 | 1.13 | |
| Father resisted independence | .86 | 1.08 | | .93 | 1.09 | | .89 | 1.14 | .91 | 1.11 | |
| Mother resisted independence | 1.19 | 1.18 | | 1.22 | 1.19 | | 1.27 | 1.34 | 1.24 | 1.25 | |
| How helpful father | 3.53 | 1.04 | | 3.50 | 1.07 | | 3.27 | 1.10 | 3.41 | 1.08 | |
| How helpful mother | 3.83 | .87 | | 4.02 | .92 | * | 3.75 | .96 | 3.92 | .94 | |
| Felt rejected by father | .79 | 1.16 | * | 1.13 | 1.26 | | 1.16 | 1.40 | 1.14 | 1.31 | ** |
| Felt rejected by mother | .88 | 1.11 | | .93 | 1.23 | | 1.14 | 1.30 | 1.01 | 1.26 | |
| Deep affection toward father | 3.37 | 1.17 | | 3.16 | 1.21 | | 3.08 | 1.30 | 3.13 | 1.24 | ** |
| Deep affection toward mother | 3.52 | 1.06 | | 3.61 | 1.18 | * | 3.24 | 1.13 | 3.47 | 1.17 | |
| How solicitous father | 2.33 | 1.17 | * | 2.03 | 1.01 | | 1.91 | .96 | 3.01 | 1.00 | ** |
| How solicitous mother | 2.97 | 1.23 | * | 2.68 | 1.21 | | 2.57 | 1.20 | 2.36 | 1.21 | ** |
| How friendly father | 2.88 | 1.14 | * | 3.69 | 1.04 | | 3.66 | 1.09 | 3.68 | 1.06 | ** |
| How friendly mother | 3.08 | 1.12 | * | 3.95 | .93 | | 3.79 | .98 | 3.89 | .95 | ** |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| How domineering father | 2.58 | 1.06 | * | 1.74 | 1.38 | | 1.76 | 1.36 | | 1.74 | 1.37 | ** |
| How domineering mother | 2.65 | .94 | * | 1.75 | 1.28 | | 2.03 | 1.31 | | 1.85 | 1.30 | ** |
| Conflict with father | 1.10 | 1.21 | | 1.34 | 1.23 | | 1.19 | 1.25 | | 3.71 | 1.24 | |
| Conflict with mother | 1.24 | 1.10 | * | 1.61 | 1.16 | | 1.56 | 1.18 | | 3.40 | 1.17 | ** |
| Attachment to father | 3.56 | 1.04 | * | 3.17 | 1.06 | | 3.03 | 1.13 | | 3.12 | 1.09 | ** |
| Attachment to mother | 3.95 | .88 | * | 3.66 | 1.02 | * | 3.35 | 1.00 | | 3.55 | 1.03 | ** |
| Parental Characteristics (5 point scales) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| How self-confident father | 3.49 | .94 | * | 3.80 | 1.04 | | 3.68 | 1.01 | | 3.76 | 1.03 | ** |
| How self-confident mother | 3.29 | 1.05 | | 3.36 | 1.06 | | 3.27 | 1.09 | | 3.32 | 1.07 | |
| How intelligent father | 4.16 | .71 | | 4.25 | .84 | * | 3.87 | .90 | | 4.11 | .88 | |
| How intelligent mother | 3.97 | .69 | | 4.05 | .86 | * | 3.80 | .82 | | 3.96 | .86 | |
| Parents Encouraged | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| college (2 pt) | 1.86 | .35 | | 1.86 | .35 | * | 1.72 | .45 | | 1.80 | .40 | |
| good grades (3 pt) | 3.76 | .74 | | 3.69 | .82 | * | 3.47 | .99 | | 3.61 | .89 | ** |
| acceleration in school (5 pt) | 2.45 | .52 | | 2.55 | .57 | | 2.45 | .56 | | 2.51 | .57 | |

* planned comparisons between adjacent columns are significant $p < .02$
** planned comparisons between Terman cohort and contemporary cohort are significant $p < .02$